



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

| APPLICATION NO.   | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.       | CONFIRMATION NO.       |
|---|-------------|----------------------|---------------------------|------------------------|
| 09/788,674  | 02/21/2001  | Sergey N. Razumov    | 59036-014                 | 6036                   |
| 7590<br>MCDERMOTT, WILL & EMERY<br>600 13th Street, N.W.<br>Washington, DC 20005-3096 |             |                      | EXAMINER<br>FADOK, MARK A |                        |
|   |             | ART UNIT<br>3625     |                           | PAPER NUMBER           |
|   |             |                      | MAIL DATE<br>05/03/2007   | DELIVERY MODE<br>PAPER |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

|                              |                               |                         |
|------------------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------|
| <b>Office Action Summary</b> | <b>Application No.</b>        | <b>Applicant(s)</b>     |
|                              | 09/788,674                    | RAZUMOV, SERGEY N.      |
|                              | <b>Examiner</b><br>Mark Fadok | <b>Art Unit</b><br>3625 |

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 26 February 2007.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**.                    2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 24,25,27,28,33,34,39 and 40 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 24,25,27,28,33,34,39 and 40 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)          | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____                                      |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)          | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____  | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                          |

## DETAILED ACTION

### ***Response to Request for Continued Examination***

The examiner is in receipt of applicant's response to office action mailed 10/27/2006, which was received 2/26/2007. Acknowledgement is made to the amendment of claim 24, the cancellation of claims 1-23,26,29-32,35-38, and the addition of claims 39 and 40, leaving claims 24,25,27,28,33, 34 ,39 and 40 as open to prosecution. The examiner has considered applicant's amendment and arguments but does not find them persuasive, therefore the previous office action modified as necessitated by amendment follows:

### **Examiner's Note**

Examiner has cited particular columns and line numbers or figures in the references as applied to the claims below for the convenience of the applicant. Although the specified citations are representative of the teachings in the art and are applied to the specific limitations within the individual claim, other passages and figures may apply as well. It is respectfully requested from the applicant, in preparing the responses, to fully consider the references in entirety as potentially teaching all or part of the claimed invention, as well as the context of the passage as taught by the prior art or disclosed by the examiner.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

- (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the

invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

**Claims 24,25,33 and 34 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Vallabh (US 7,054,832) in view of Khan (US 6,263,316).**

**In regards to claims 24,25,33 and 34,** Vallabh teaches all the features of the instant claims except as follows. Vallabh discloses storing purchased products in a remote site for later pick-up (Fig 1) automatically assigning a pickup location (col 11, lines 50-67), then further direct the product be delivered to the assigned pickup point (col 10, lines 50-65) in a movable arraignment (FIG 12, item 320). Vallabh further teaches dynamically assigning by determining which stations are available (col 11, lines 50-67, but does not specifically mention that the pickup station is automatically released when the ordered purchase is obtained. Khan teaches automatically indicating when a transaction is completed and a vehicle has left a pickup area (col 7 and 8). It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include in Vallabh automatically indicating that the vehicle has left the pick-up station, because this would enable a quick transfer of goods (col 9, lines 25-30).

**In regards to claim 39,** the combination of Vallabh and Khan teach wherein the control system is configured for automatically releasing the purchase pick-up point assigned to the customer in response to payment by the customer (Khan, fig 8, lines 1-

5).

**Claims 27 and 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Vallabh in view of Khan and further in view of Joseph (5,635,906).**

**In regards to claims 27 and 28,** Vallabh teaches picking up orders that are assembled by a third party, but does not specifically mention that the old and well known process of inspecting the package to assure that all the items have been correctly packaged for pick-up is present. Joseph teaches using a weight system to assure that all the products have been provided to the customer. It would have been obvious to include in Vallabh the use of the weight system as taught by Joseph, because this is a quick and efficient method to assure that all the ordered products have been included in the package for pick-up, thus quickly moving the customer from the lane so that another customer can use it for pick-up.

**In regards to claim 40,** the combination of Vallabh, Khan and Joseph teach identifying availability of a pick-up station (see Vallabh in view of Khan supra) and completing inspection to indicate the conclusion of a transaction and releasing the purchased product (Joseph, col 2, line 50 – col 3, line 4). Since the inspection assures prior to release pickup station the combination meets the feature as stated in the instant claims.

***Response to Arguments***

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 24,25,27,28,33 and 34 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection necessitated by amendment.

Applicant argues that Vallabh does not teach automatically assigning a pickup point. The examiner disagrees and directs the applicant's attention to col 12, lines 5-20, where it is clear that the system automatically relays information to the customer after the customer has been identified.

***Conclusion***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to **Mark Fadok** whose telephone number is **571.272.6755**. The examiner can normally be reached Monday thru Friday 8:00 AM to 5:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, **Jeffrey A. Smith** can be reached on **571.272.6763**.

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

***Commissioner for Patents***

***P.O. Box 1450***

Art Unit: 3625

Alexandria, Va. 22313-1450

or faxed to:

**571-273-8300** [Official communications; including

After Final communications labeled

"Box AF"]

For general questions the receptionist can be reached at

571.272.3600

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Mark Fadok  
Primary Examiner